DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 456 HE 012 483

TITLE	The University of Alabama: A Study in Bureaucracy.
INSTITUTION	Alabama State Univ. System, Montgomery.
SPONS AGENCY	Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education, Cambridge, Mass.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	51p.; For related Sloan Commission documents see HE 012 421-427, HE 012 429-432, HE 012 434-439, HE 012 442-445, HE 012 448-449, HE 012 465-474, HE 012 476-480, HE 012 482-490.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Records; Affirmative Action; *Budgeting; Bureaucracy; *Compliance (Legal); Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Finance; Federal Government; Federal Legislation; *Federal Regulation; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Self Evaluation (Groups); State Boards of Education; State Government; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Sloan Commission Studies; *University of Alabama

ABSTRACT

Some of the bureaucratic forces that affect the University of Alabama are discussed. External forces include the federal and state governments, the statewide coordinating body for higher education, accrediting agencies, and the university system under which the institution operates. Other forces are at work internally that compound the bureaucratic process, usually in the name of planning or efficiency or accountability. One way in which the Legislature of Alabama responded to its growing interest in education was the creation of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE). Three different budget requests are compiled by the university: one for the university system, one for ACHE, and a third for the state budget office. While each contains essentially the same dollar figures as the others, it is prepared in different forms, based on the requirements of each agency. Passage of a budget by the state legislature is not the end of the process, because the next budgeting cycle begins and the institutions must file followup reports. Both the university system and ACHE are involved in the program development and review process, and the legislature is involved in a limited degree. At the heart of the controversy over federal regulations in higher education are affirmative action plan requirements, Title IX, and the Buckley Amendment. The largest amount of governmental reporting is required by routine paperwork in the areas of contracts and grants and financial aid. The effects of bureaucracy on faculty members and university administrators are considered. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184456

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
A STUDY IN BUREAUCRACY

Prepared for the
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sloan Comm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 403

INTRODUCTION

Administering The University of Alabama was once a fairly simple matter. The president of the institution prepared a budget request every biennium, submitted it to the Governor and the Legislature, fought for its approval, and usually got a good deal of what he asked for. He could create new educational programs as he saw fit, depending on available money to support them. The Administrative staff was small.

But times have changed. Higher education throughout Alabama has come a long way from those simple days. The college population in the state has quadrupled over the last decade, a network of 20 junior colleges and 29 technical institutes has been created from scratch, five former state teachers colleges have become universities, and four new universities have been created in the state's major cities. Expenditures for higher education have skyrocketed, as has the competition for funds among institutions. And state government, alarmed over the growth, has made a belated attempt to control it.

The federal government, viewing similar trends across the nation, has also stepped in to take a tighter rein over universities. Feeling they have a right to regulate and demand reports from those institutions they fund directly or indirectly, Washington has instituted everything from Equal Opportunity regulations to complex reporting procedures for financial aid monies. In order to comply with these regulations, the University estimated, in a study sponsored by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, that

it spends some $250,000 per year. University officials stress that this is a conservative figure; the actual total probably approaches half a million dollars, all of this just to report and comply.

The result has been inevitable bureaucratization. The college president in Alabama, especially at a major university, finds his sense of initiative throttled, sometimes curtailed, by forces outside his institution. Other forces are at work internally which compound the bureaucratic process, usually in the name of planning or efficiency or accountability. And while Alabama has come late to the bureaucracy game, it is fast learning the rules and frustrations.

This report is an attempt to chronicle some of the bureaucratic forces at work on and in The University of Alabama -- external forces such as federal and state government, the statewide coordinating body for higher education, accrediting agencies, the University System under which the institution operates -- and the internal forces which have come to life in parallel with the external ones.

University old-timers tell tales of one Luther Callahan, a treasurer of the institution some years ago, who ruled the purse with an iron fist. Callahan, it was said, controlled every penny. A faculty member or department head had to account for every pencil bought with University funds. And the Bursar's office was forced to delay the mailing of student bills at one point because it had run out of postage money in its budget and Callahan refused to allocate more. It was bureaucracy at its lowest common denominator.

But those were lean years for the University. Funding has increased dramatically in the past decade and the institution is not forced to be so penny-conscious these days. At the same time, the University has grown to a complexity which could not be controlled by one financial officer. A sizeable bureaucracy exists where Luther Callahan once sat, leading one institutional official to observe, "Bureaucracy exists only where you can afford it." Increased funding, from whatever source, has led to increased control. Bureaucracy exacts its price.

As one University vice president put it, the University is looking for some way to control the controllers. The increased controls have obscured the purpose of higher education, replacing its efforts to contribute to broad social goals with compliance measures forcing the University, among other things, to act as a national employment service.

When this study was first undertaken, the initial impulse was to set up an internal bureaucracy to direct it -- to form committees, read all of the available literature, conduct a scientific opinion survey, ponder and cogitate, re-invent the wheel.

On second thought, it seemed that more might be accomplished in a simpler manner by a journalistic, anecdotal approach to the problem. This report, then, is the work of a small team of "journalistic investigators" who have approached the study much as they would the researching and writing of a series of articles on bureaucracy in higher education.

EXTERNAL FORCES

THE ALABAMA LEGISLATURE

Budgeting for education in Alabama was once the task primarily of the executive branch of state government, in particular the State Budget Office, directed by the State Finance Director, a cabinet appointee of the Governor. Budget requests were submitted directly from the institutions, compared with available revenue, scaled down to reasonable levels, compiled into comprehensive budget for public education, and submitted to the legislature.

An institution might then go directly to the Legislature to plead special cases, and might get some minor alterations in the Governor's budget recommendation, but by and large the work had been done by the time the document left the State Budget Office.

The complexity of the budgeting process has increased enormously as legislators have become concerned about the large amounts of money being spent for public education at every level. Now, the Legislature requires periodic and detailed reports of how appropriations are spent, and has developed a growing penchant for investigative oversight into higher education fundings and operations. Higher education has moved full circle from the honored status of "sacred cow" to the frustrated position of "legislative whipping boy". Forced into a defensive posture, institutions have responded by increasing their capacity for accounting for themselves.

ALABAMA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

One way in which the Legislature responded to its growing interest in educational funding was the creation of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE), a coordinating body which,

while having none of the powers of the typical "board of regents" concept, has become increasingly influential in regulating the state's four-year institutions. ACHE is charged under its legislative mandate with making budget recommendations for higher education and with approving new educational programs in the institutions.

The creation of a body such as ACHE had been recommended in Alabama by a special study commission as early as 1958, before the tremendous growth of the 1960's began. But is was not until 1969 that the Legislature created the agency and not until 1972 that it was staffed and fully in operation. Meanwhile, each of the institutions maintains its own board of trustees.

In carrying out its mandate, ACHE has in turn placed major new administrative responsibilities on the institutions under its aegis.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA SYSTEM

The University of Alabama (UA) is part of a three institution system, which includes The University of Alabama in Birmingham (UAB) and The University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH), and is governed by a single self-perpetuating Board of Trustees created under the Alabama Constitution.

The University once consisted of the main campus in Tuscaloosa and a number of branch campuses in cities throughout the state. The branch campus in Birmingham, attached to the University's medical school, became a major urban institution in its own right, and the Huntsville branch became an important regional university.

In 1969, the Board of Trustees elected to name presidents at each of the three institutions and had those officers report directly to the Board.

In 1973, with all three institutions growing in size and complexity, the Board of Trustees created the University System Staff, a small group of professionals who provided legal, financial, and program development expertise directly to the Board, but had no role in the actual governance of the three institutions.

In 1976, the Board went a step further by creating the post of Chancellor of the University System, an officer with expanded authority to act for the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor was to assume major duties in planning, budgeting, and legislative relations and to be the chief executive officer of the System. The System staff became the Chancellor's staff.

In 1977, a Vice-Chancellor was appointed to assist the Chancellor in the performance of those duties, and the Chancellor's staff was bolstered by the addition of an expert in program review and development.

In the performance of their duties, the Chancellor and his staff of necessity require information, plans, reports, justifications, etc. from the three institutions.

BUREAUCRACY AS PROCESS

THE BUDGET

Financial activities, including budgeting and accounting, are a year-round function of The University of Alabama. The state legislature meets annually and the formulation of a budget request begins far in advance of the regular January sessions, and proceeds along two, sometimes three, parallel tracks.

Typically, the institution will begin the budget process in June of a given year, once the regular session of the legislature has concluded.

Three different budget requests are compiled -- one for the University system, one for ACHE, and a third for the State Budget Office. While each contains essentially the same dollar figures as the others, it is prepared in different forms, based on the requirements of the agency for which it is being readied.

ACHE's budgeting process is driven by a complex formula, the basis of which is the institution's "credit-hour production." The State Budget Office, however, compiles a "program" budget. And the University System uses a third system which has elements of both formula and program approaches. In many cases, the agency to which the University is reporting will require different types of information, as well as different formats.

What it amounts to, according to one University fiscal officer, is a "hodge-podge" of financial reporting that changes year-by-year according to the whims of the asking agencies. Thus, the University has been unable to automate its financial information system for fear of creating expensive computer programs which will

be outdated within months. At least two major professional staff positions (with attendant clerical assistance) have recently been created in the Office of Financial Affairs to deal with the problems associated with the volume and complexity of budget reporting required.

(The institution also reports to some external agencies who have no control over the University. The State Board of Education, for instance, which has no jurisdiction over four-year institutions, asks for and received yearly reports on enrollments, expenditures, and other matters. University fiscal officers contend the reports are in a form that was outmoded 20 years ago, and they have no idea what purpose the information serves at the State Board. But the reporting continues, because it has been done in the past. The University has complained, but without response.)

The budget process begins at the departmental level, as the department chairman or administrative director, in consultation with faculty and staff, formulates a request for funds. These are routed through the dean or administrative division head, on to the University vice-presidents and finally to the president of the institution, with each level analyzing, adjusting, and justifying before passing on the request to the next level.

Once the final dollar figure of the request is approved by the president, the document is sent to the Office of Financial Affairs where it is translated into the language of the three agencies at the next level.

The completed budget goes first to the University System office where it is analyzed by the staff and Chancellor, then acted upon by the Board of Trustees, along with the budgets of the other two Systems institutions. Finally, it is sent back to the institution, with permission to submit it (in different format) to ACHE.

By early August, the budget has gone to ACHE where it will be analyzed by the staff, hearings will be held, and the Commission will finally combine it with the budgets of all other public four-year institutions for submission to the Alabama Legislature as a recommended unified budget for higher education. The review process at ACHE will involve a good deal of time and effort on the part of the University in supplying additional data and attending hearings and conferences.

This process will continue through the Fall, while another parallel process is taking place in conjunction with the State Budget Office. That agency is making up its own "program" budget and is gathering data and requests from the institution in much the same way as ACHE, though in different format. In the latter months of the Fall, the Legislature's interim budget committees will begin hearings on the institution's budget request (the one submitted to the State Budget Office) involving additional data, trips, etc.

At the first of the following year, both ACHE and the State Budget Office (through the Governor) will submit budgets to the Legislature as it begins its regular session. In one recent session, the two budgets were combined by the Governor and presented as a "unified" budget from higher education but this is not always the case.

In any case, the Legislature must make the final determination on spending allocations to the institutions, as to other state agencies.

Passage of a budget by the Legislature is not the end of the process. Even as the next budgeting cycle is beginning, the institution is beginning to file follow-up reports. Both the State Budget Office and the University System require quarterly reports of expenditures by the institution, and again in different formats.

In normal times, the budgeting process occupies the complete attention of about 10% of the 125-person staff of the Office of Financial Affairs. But times are not always normal. As the regular volume of activity has grown substantially over the past few years, so has the instance of special crises, most of them precipitated by the legislature.

Two recent instances involve legislative investigations of all or part of post-secondary education, both of which caused massive bureaucratic problems within the institutions, and both of which were instigated by special interim legislative committee which did their work between regular sessions.

The first was an attempt by a joint interim committee to determine if the state's junior colleges were padding their enrollment figures. In the process of investigating this possibility, the committee called for elaborately-detailed information on enrollments, class sizes, graduations, and other data from <u>every</u> post-secondary institution in the state, so as not to single out the junior colleges, Reams of paper and hours of time were consumed in compiling the reports, most of which got only a cursory glance from the committee.

The second investigation was of greater magnitude -- a full-blown probe by a joint House-Senate budget committee, led by the Lieutenant Governor, into virtually every aspect of the operation of four-year public institutions. The committee submitted a long list of demands for data to the institution, and the brunt of the work fell on the Office of Financial Affairs. A large proportion of the staff was involved in compiling the date over a span of several weeks, and several temporary personnel were added to assist in the work. Working under an extremely tight deadline, the office produced a stack of reports some two feet high. The legislative committee and its staff took a cursory glance at the material, conducted several days of highly-publicized hearings, and recommended, without saying why, that the budgets of four-year institutions be cut 4%.

University officials see a steadily-escalating trend toward legislative investigations and oversight. Some of the efforts are prompted by genuine concern over the burgeoning education budget, but others are little more than political "fishing expeditions." Unfortunately for the institution, there is no choice but to respond when the legislature demands information.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Program development and review follows a similar, if somewhat less complex, procedure. Both the University System and ACHE are intimately involved in this process, and to a much more limited respect (that of providing funds) the legislature.

Development of a new academic program begins at the departmental level where the department chairman develops the proposal, supposedly in response to student or professional demand. Once the dean of the appropriate college approves the program it goes to the vice-president for Academic Affairs, and then to the president of the University. In the "good old days", only one further step was needed for approval and implementation -- an okay from the University Board of Trustees. But now, with ACHE in existence and the UA System much more complex, the process becomes a good deal more difficult.

Under the new procedure, the program proposal is carried to the Chancellor, who refers it to his staff for study and recommendation, probably entailing the gathering of more data from the institution and a round of conferences and studies (often involving representatives of the other two system institutions).

Once the staff and Chancellor have approved the proposal, it returns to the institution's vice-president for Academic Affairs, who forwards it to ACHE for study and action. Again, a rigorous process of information-gathering and analysis takes place, involving reports, plans, justifications, conferences, and hearings. The ACHE staff dissects the program and recommends its approval or rejection to the full Commission, which hears further evidence and then takes final action.

If the program is approved by ACHE, it then returns to the institutional vice-president for Academic Affairs who takes it in

turn back to the Chancellor who takes it in turn to the Board of Trustees for analysis and final action.

All of the above applies to an undergraduate academic program. A graduate program would involve additional steps -- referral to a graduate council at the institution level and another graduate council at the ACHE level.

It is a process that rarely takes less than six months under the most optimum conditions, and often takes as long as two years. Thus, a student who needed a particular program upon entering the University as a freshman might not be able to get it until the student's junior year. And the toll on the institution in terms of administrative detail during the approval period is enormous.

THE EMERGING SYSTEM

Though new in concept, the University System is evolving a personality of its own and making itself felt as a force in the administration of the three institutions under its jurisdiction. The newly-appointed Chancellor has authority and powers which the former System staff did not have and is now assuming a major role in programs review and budget formulation. Moreover, the System office indicates a willingness to become more involved in the administration of existing programs on the three campuses and in the standardization of administrative and academic policy at the institutions.

For example, there are components of the System's medical education program on each of the three campuses -- Tuscaloosa, Birmingham and Huntsville -- and this had led to the formulation of

guidelines at the System level for their operation. A Board of Turstees committee, working through the Chancellor and his Staff, coordinates the medical education process, and as a means of control, requires periodic and detailed reports on how the institutions are following its guidelines. There are also frequent inter-institutional conferences and meetings necessitated by the level of bureaucracy thrust on the system.

What has happened in the medical education program is likely to be emulated in other academic ventures. There are similar programs in business administration, liberal arts, nursing, science, and other fields on each of the three campuses. Standardization may also occur in such fields as investment policy, employment practices, personnel policy, and student affairs policy. And once standard practices are established, there must be some requirement for reporting on how the standards are met.

The Chancellor and his staff have also demonstrated a penchant for long-range planning, something that has not had major emphasis at the University. Development of a five-year plan, updated yearly, would mean major new administrative responsibilities at the campus level. And the filing of annual reports department-by department would cause a similar burden.

Thus, while the University System is an evolving mechanism, its future directions are becoming clear. Bureaucracy breeds bureaucracy, whether for good or ill purposes.

OTHER EXTERNAL FORCES

STATE AGENCIES

Executive agencies of state government once had little business with or control over higher education in Alabama, but two forces have changed this: first, the tendency of state agencies to use University expertise in problem-solving; and second, the growing tendency of the federal government to funnel funds through state agencies.

An example of the latter is the School of Social Work, whose budget consists of 50% non-University funds, most of them derived in one way or another from the federal government. Some $400,000 in Title 20 funds annually comes from the State Department of Pensions and Security (DPS), the state social welfare agency, which depends upon the School of Social Work for the training of most of the state's accredited social workers.

The annual grant of funds from DPS is entirely in federal money, but the state agency makes the allocation and determines many of the prerequisites for its allocation. The School of Social Work, on the other hand, must make a detailed accounting of its use of the funds, and moreover must report to three levels of bureaucrary -- the State Department of Pensions and Security, the Atlanta regional office of HEW, and the Washington headquarters of HEW.

Many other academic and administrative departments encounter similar reporting and accounting requirements in connection with arrangements they have with state agencies. The Psychology Department undertaking a major study of the state's prison system or the

the Office of Publication and Creative Services designing television public service announcements for the State Employment Service find that use of state funds creates a major burden of paperwork, similar to that connected with federal projects.

ACCREDITING AGENCIES

As is the case with any major university, The University of Alabama enjoys the accreditation of many of its academic programs through national accreditation agencies. But with the enjoyment comes the agony of earning and keeping accreditation from a bureaucratic standpoint.

As associate vice-president for Academic Affairs called it "nothing short of fantastic in terms of the time, energy and cost devoted to the accreditation process," especially when it involves the entire institution, as is the case with the accreditation of the University by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Such an undertaking begins two years before the renewal date and involves practically every faculty member and administrator in an extensive program of self-study and evaluation. The Office of Academic Affairs assumes the major institutional burden during such a period, turning out "mountains of paperwork" in the process.

Individual academic units undergo a similar and equally time-consuming process in their accreditation efforts. The School of Communication, for example, devoted the time and energy of two full-time persons for six months prior to a formal accreditation

visit for its Journalism program, preparing the self-study and evaluative materials.

But that experience pales compared to a school which finds itself in trouble with an accrediting agency. The University's School of Social Work, when ordered to show cause why its addreditation should not be lifted, began a flurry of activity which rivalled that of the University-wide accreditation process described above. Virtually every faculty and staff member was involved for several months in curriculum review and revision, in extensive self-study of every aspect of the school's operation, and in the compiling of reports and analyses to present to the accrediting body. In response to the requirements of the accrediting agency, administrative responsibilities were increased and additional personnel hired to meet those responsibilities.

The dean of the School of Social Work stoutly defends accreditation as necessary for assuring quality education, but admits that the process involves an enormous amount of time, even under the best of circumstances, even when accreditation is not in jeopardy. And,he says, "you must staisfy them even when there is an honest difference of opinion about their requirements."

PUBLIC STEWARDSHIP

Another major external force which leads to bureaucratization at The University of Alabama is the notion that a public institution has a special obligation to be a good steward of public funds.

As an assistant vice president for Financial Affairs explained, "When you feel more responsibility to the state, you tend to centralize activities such as purchasing, property control, personnel actions, shipping and receiving, printing, and the like."

The University operates under a state bid law and under state regulations on such matters as travel, entertainment, etc. And the University's practices in these areas are closely monitored by state auditors. The tendency of the University is to centralize activities to cut down on possible violations or abuses, and thus the University may create a $20,000 bureaucracy to eliminate a $500 abuse, simply because it feels the special obligation of stewardship and "accountability" of a public institution.

Bureaucracy also travels under the aegis of "efficiency" -- the desire of academic and administrative departments for centralized expertise which leads to creation of such entities as a printing shop, a campus mail service, a central shipping and receiving warehouse, and the like. Cost control may or may not be the result -- but bureaucracy invariably is.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

At the heart of the controversy over federal regulation in higher education are Affirmative Action plan requirements, Title IX and the Buckley Amendment. These three areas of regulation are being singled out by educators as major examples of federal intrusion and its overwhelming cost to higher education.

The University of Alabama has expended massive efforts over the past several years in order to insure that it complies with these measures. While University-wide efforts in the areas of Affirmative Action and Title IX have caused many problems and reaped few benefits, the institution of the Buckley Amendment, surprisingly, as it is the measure most complained about nationwide, has been a simple and relativly problem free process.

This discrepancy points out the extreme complexity of the issues involved in federal regulation, and a careful examination of this university's compliance efforts should serve to further delineate these issues and their practical consequences.

Affirmative Action

In 1969, a group of federal civil rights officers came to the campus to help develop a compliance procedure for Affirmative Action. Immediately thereafter a corrective plan was formulated and approved. Intensive involvement in Affirmative Action began in 1971, with a comprehensive plan being instituted first in 1972. Three subsequent revisions have been made in the University's plan in 1973, 1975 and 1977.

Ongoing efforts in the area of Affirmative Action (AA) are extensive. A high level administrative officer, the director of the department of Institutional Research, spends approximately 50% of her work week on AA matters. She meets weekly with the Executive Vice-President and four area AA officers in order to discuss and update problems and policies as part of the grievance procedure.

Staff directly involved in AA administrative and paperwork includes these four area officers, all of them high level administrators who must spend 10% of their time on AA procedures. The director of Institutional Research uses the services of a secretary, who spends 75% of her work week on data collection, and a librarian, who spends 20% of the week on maintenance of AA files and cataloguing.

According to the executive vice-president, the major burden of Affirmative Action is in the internal record keeping necessary. The University must obtain a great amount of information from each applicant for every position. Some two and a half years' worth of these supplemental application forms are presently being stored under a kitchen cabinet in the administration building awaiting computer availability. The plan must go through an update procedure each year which must be available, but is never sent in for approval unless requested.

There are many other incidental costs because of AA procedures. University officials must attend conferences at an annual cost of about $1,500 in order to keep up with ever changing regulations and precedents. The 1977 AA plan was summarized in a booklet published by the University and made available to the public at a cost of $800. Inside this booklet are listed the multitudes of procedures involved in the AA plan, including everything from employment procedures to grievance procedures, from publication of equal opportunity statements on University stationery to extensive notification procedures. This last category, of course, includes costly advertising policies, but also the University's pro forma

exercise of distributing equal opportunity memoranda internally at a cost of $150 a year.

The office of personnel services reports to HEW biennially in line with the EE06 requirements. This report must include race, sex and other data on every person working at the University, a list some 5,000 strong. According to the Institutional Research director, there is, "not a chance they can use all this information; they are four years behind in gathering and reviewing it." She also pointed out that they often cause additional problems by changing the requirements, as they are doing on a trial basis this year in classifying East Indians as black. "Doing something which causes this sort of problem on a trial basis is callous and unnecessary," the director said.

For all of this work, plus the untold hundreds of extra hours spent on the departmental level in hiring, the University has no separate budget. As the director said, "It all has to come out of somebody's skin somewhere."

All of this must be viewed in the light of a few mitigating factors. Most importantly, perhaps, as one administrator pointed out, the necessity of wide ranging Affirmative Action efforts have come about to an extent because of the University's less than completely avid attention to Civil Rights in the 1960's. "A portion of our woes now are trouble we have causedourselves," the administrator said.

Several benefits have come about because of the University's strong commitment to adding practical measures to ideologiccal support of equal opportunity. Among these are the sophistication of

hiring procedures, including the bringing of more candidates for faculty positions to campus for personal interviewing than was previously done. This University benefits in particular because of its former reputation by showing employment candidates that opportunities are, indeed, equal here where 1950's and 60's political events contradicted that image.

Despite these auxiliary benefits, the University can still state adamantly, as the executive vice-president does, that, "The bureaucratic effort to monitor federal regulation is not contributing a nickel's worth to black and woman employment than would be accomplished anyway." This conclusion is supported by figures; despite the University's comprehensive efforts at seeking out minority application, there has been no significant increase in their hiring here. "The pool of black Ph.D.'s is not much bigger now than it has been," said the vice-president, "and competition is stiffer."

The University has exhibited as many good faith efforts as is institutionally possible, along the rather nebulous guidelines set by the government, including using referral services, leaving positions open for lengthy periods and advertising positions in minority oriented journalis (Ms., Black Scholar) as well as academic publications.

Because of the openendedness of the guidelines, the University has developed its own plan, which has not come under review. As the vice-president said, this effort to insure compliance has led

the University, along with many others, to be perhaps over responsive and spend more time on the procedural aspect of Affirmative Action. The government, thus, by being hard handed in its demands for equity, has created such a paper mill as to make higher education lose the sense behind equality in hiring.

Not only has this University not received as much benefit from Affirmative Action efforts as money and time they have put in, nationwide this federal system has only created yet another system ineffective at solving the problem for which it was designed.

Title IX

Perhaps the best way in which to explicate the costs involved in the University's Title IX compliance procedures is to examine the time involved in preparing the self-study required by the regulation.

The University's self-study took place during the 1975-76 school year, with the fall semester serving as a preparatory stage. During this study, the director of the Department of Institutional Research spent 25% of her time during the fall semester and 50% of her time during the spring semester solely in preparing and organizing this report.

Some 76 people from every portion of the campus were members of the self-study task force, each spending at least ten hours on the project, with those in student services spending a great deal more than this. A University vice-president served as Title IX coordinator, and, along with the research director and a 15 member advisory committee, he directed the intensive effort to examine every facet of the campus for sex discrimination. The advisory

committee, which included vice-presidents, deans and department heads, demanded a great deal of time from the members' normal duties. Each committee member spent at least 20 hours in committee meetings, with an average of two hours reading necessary for every hour in session.

There were eight sub-committees assigned to separate areas, each with its own report; several of these committees found it necessary to divide themselves up further in order to insure full coverage. The duplicating costs were horrendous, as the amount of supporting material added to the reports made it easier to measure the final report by the pound rather than by the page. As in the Affirmative Action efforts, none of the Title IX proceedings had a separate budget; much of the sub-committee report duplication was done in the individual members' departments at their own cost. The total cost of duplicating alone was close to $1,000.

A few examples from the self-study should serve to give an idea of the scope of the project:

Bidgood (a classroom building). There are two restrooms for men on the first floor. Consideration should be given to converting one to a women's restroom.

Doster The School of Home Economics is predominantly female. The male/female enrollment should be monitored and if the pattern changes then consideration should be given to changing the sex designation of restrooms to appropriately reflect the enrollment.

Access to Course Offerings, Advising, and Counseling Concerning course access (general): The catalogues of The University of Alabama were examined for sex biased statements. Few, if any, statements were limited to one sex or the other...

The Counseling Center has made a staff member available to conduct workshops in overcoming sex role stereotyping. These workshops included information on standardized testing...

Financial Aid and Employment Assistance

-The Law School administers a scholarship program for its students. There are no funds restricted by sex.

Policy Dissemination, Recruitment, and Admission

-All offices reported that a concerted effort was being made in the area of nondiscrimination on the basis of sex. Two notable examples are Engineering and Alumni Affairs.

These are only a small sampling of the findings of the various committees. Recommendations were made in the self-study to correct every abuse, no matter how minor, that was found.

Work is still ongoing, and costing the University, in several of the areas studied by the report. These include women's athletics (which the vice-president for Student Affairs says is the area under Title IX which has the most far reaching funding applications), the Law School student grievance procedure, and a few other areas.

Much of the Title IX procedure and the application of the regulations involved were completely unnecessary and even harmful, according to University officials.

In the self-study, for example, the school had to document nondiscrimination in areas where it should be self evident. As the director of Research pointed out, one is not likely to find enrollment quotas in our situation as a state public institution facing a down enrollment period.

The employment section of Title IX and the accompanying self study was completely duplicative of Affirmative Action.

The "drive to parallel" led to some ridiculous situations, as in the case of women's dorms having a lock system to protect residents from rape. It would not have been rational to put lock system on the outside doors of male dorms, so the committee decided to draw the line here and in a few other cases in lieu of precedents being set at other schools.

The director of Research pointed out that, although every piece of University literature was examined for the use of generic language, recent studies have shown that the use of the generic 'man' does not impact upon attitudes nor does it have a debilitating influence of any sort.

Title IX, then,cost the University a great deal more money than it should have because of the excess reporting necessary in the self-study. While bringing about some needed reforms in athletics and honorary designations it also harmed some programs. For example, the athletic section of Title IX states that money must be applied by demand for a sport after a certain equity between sexes is met. This demand clause leaves the athletic department free to not create a men's gymnastic program, as they move the funds into more popular sports such as football.

Another basic problem with the necessity for a Title IX self-study is its contrariety to established American justice. By having to prove nondiscrimination rather than facing charges, the University is, in effect, being treated as no common citizen would be.

Buckley Amendment

By comparison, and contrary to national education outcries, the University had little trouble implementing the Buckley Amendment; neither has there been any significant amount of extra work since its implementation.

A committee composed of seven people met once a week over a period of two months in order to formulate policy for the Buckley Amendment. The process was simple for two reasons. The University had already been operating under many of the demands of the amendment, such as having stopped sending parents their childrens' grades some three years prior. The other factor was that the original guidelines for the amendment, although vague, were quickly restated by the government in concise form in the final regulations. This, of course, was not the case with Title IX and Affirmative Action.

The Buckley Amendment implementation, then, as the administrator in charge of the process said, has not caused the University to change enough for it to be of any consequence.

FEDERAL REPORTING

Educators nationwide are voicing concern over Title IX, Affirmative Action and the Buckley Amendment as examples of federal regulation and intrusion, but at The University of Alabama the largest amount of governmental reporting is necessitated not by these acts, but by routine paperwork in the areas of Contracts and Grants and Financial Aids.

There is a vast amount of reporting demanded from the University in these areas by a wide range of federal and state agencies. Officials who handle this paperwork on a day to day basis at the University say it is costly and, in many cases, unnecessary.

Contracts and Grants

Alabama, being a state public institution, depends upon so-called soft money for approximately one seventh of its operations. While some of this money goes to individual research, most of the funding is for projects of direct benefit to the community, state and nation. The processing of extra paperwork and the costs of fruitless audits are thus not only a burden upon the University, but upon those the projects serve as well.

The usual disclaimer in this situation must, of course, be made. The University receives some $10 million each year from a wide variety of public and private agencies and foundations and this money is of unquestionable value in the pursuit of excellence in service and education. For this the University is grateful, and,

to an extent, accepts the burden of reporting to these sources as an adjunct to grant activities.

When the components of a report are reasonable, the University is often only too happy to comply. The reports the College of Engineering must make are an example of this relationship. According to the dean of that college, he receives requests on a regular and irregular basis from such agencies as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education at HEW. These reports ask for Engineering manpower figures, a breakdown by many categories of students in Engineering, and other statistics.

"It is a lot or work," said the dean; "it sometimes takes the registrar days to fill out each manpower report." He indicated, however, that these reports were, "not unreasonable," particularly because the school usually gets an immediate return for its work by way of scholarships and nationwide trend statistics. "These reports are useful," the dean said, "as we get an overall picture on needs in the field of Engineering as well as job opportunities for our graduates."

Most of the reporting done on campus is not handled through the individual colleges, however, but by the office of Contracts and Grants. It is here that unnecessary costs are centered.

The office of the assistant comptroller for Contracts and Grants, employing seven people full-time, assists University project directors in preparing budgets for their grant applications as part of its normal duties, but also must handle the accounting and reporting necessary with each project. It is this latter work,

incidental to any service the projects are accomplishing, that take up most of the time of the office.

According to the assistant comptroller, the regularity of reporting varies with each agency, even within similar divisions of government. Some require monthly, some quarterly, and some annually reporting, including a breakdown of the fiscal and property management in connection with the grants.

"What they want to know is what you spent and how you spent it in a breakdown by salary benefits, supplies, equipment, travel and other direct costs, plus the various indirect costs of the project," said the comptroller.

He said that the agencies rarely have similar type forms and that individual agencies often change the information requirements from year to year. This causes less problems than one would expect, but the comptroller said they could see little reason for the changes, other than as a way of, "justifying new jobs within the agencies."

Final reports must be filed with each project, with additional paperwork involved if extra reports such as property disposition, invention status, new technology or classified information are required. The preparation of these final reports is an ongoing project of the office of the comptroller as information must be kept constantly updated.

According to the comptroller, about one-half of all this paperwork, "is just make-work for federal employees. They (the grants) are welcome subsidies to education, but the government is

so hide-bound to rules that they are wasting taxpaper dollars."

The immense amount of reporting was instituted because of project directors in the early years of national federal funding mishandling funds. The cost involved in reporting, however, outstretches the previous waste by abuse of grant monies.

Additional costs are incurred when the University undergoes an audit on any of its grant projects. The University has faced two large scale audits recently which should serve to illustrate the troublesome and costly nature of such undertakings.

The University's College of Education in 1976 received a contract from the U. S. Office of Education calling for a project in developing services to school systems in an eight-state region. The $181,000 contract was to be used in development of financial management training materials for post-secondary institutions, development of materials for parent education and early childhood education and development of a preliminary plan for management information system in the Southeastern states.

In August, 1976, government auditors began investigating activities of the Atlanta regional office of the Office of Education, which had approved the grant. In their investigations, three federal auditors spent 90 days on campus interviewing various University officials.

According to the assistant comptroller, the auditors had a "you had better be clean" attitude, and spent many hours during the three months dickering with him and officials in the College

of Education. "They went over a stack of documents ten inches high and want all over campus talking to people," he said. "When we heard about the audit, I spent two days reviewing the project and didn't find any irregularities; it took three auditors three months to come to the same conclusion."

The dean of the College of Education said the auditors checked every HEW contract held by the college, in addition to the grant in question, an audit that covered several million dollars in federal money.

After this lengthy process, the auditors told the University in the spring of 1977 that they had found no mismanagement of the grant funds. According to the comptroller, the audit was not aimed at the the University anyway, but was an attempt to crack down on an official in Atlanta.

The cost to the University and the federal government was great; additional costs to the school included work by the office of University Relations, which had to get involved in the affair because of national news coverage.

In a similar incident, an audit by the State Board of Corrections of an $80,000 billing for an inmate reclassification project revealed only one minor error. U. S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr. had ordered the Board of Corrections to contract with the University's Center for Correctional Psychology for the reclassification plan as part of his 1976 prison reform order.

The University completed the study, and was paid $55,839 as part of the bill by the Board of Corrections, who then took the rest of the billing to Johnson, who allowed them to delay payment until an audit was completed.

The state auditors were supplied, at the University's cost, all necessary forms for the audit, which turned up only a $283 discrepancy because of clerical errors in computing travel vouchers. Given the size of the project, this error was indeed a small one.

Once again, as the comptroller pointed out, the auditors spent more investigating the billing than they found in University error. Other indirect costs in this audit included University Relations work, because the issue was once more in the press, and most significant, the public time taken up by the state auditors and in the district courts.

Financial Aids

The University's administration of the various federal student financial aid programs of necessity involves complex reporting procedures. "A vast amount" of the paperwork requested, however, is unnecessary, according to the director of Financial Aids at Alabama.

The needless impositions upon the University include everything from poorly organized forms to poorly organized deadlines. The University administers the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG), the Supplemental Educational Opportunity

Grant (SEOG), the National Direct Student Loan (NDSL), the College Work Study Program, the Law Enforcement Educational Program (LEEP), the Federal Insured Student Loan (FISL), HEW's Bureau of Health Manpower Nursing Education Scholarship, and the combination state-federal State Supplemental Incentive Grants (SSIG).

All of these programs, save the Nursing Scholarship, have serious defects in report requests which cost the University valuable time and money.

Primary among the faults of the BEOG system is the fact that the payments of grant money must be based upon actual costs. This regulation leads to a whole scope of problems. First, the University is not able to determine actual costs until after the fall semester has begun, but must, by that time, have notified and awarded students with their financial aid packets in order for them to pay fall fees.

For this to be accomplished, the University first bases its awards system on estimated costs in order for students to file their extremely complex aids applications by late spring prior to entrance. Then, to comply with the actual costs regulation, the financial aids office puts two full-time staff members and several student aids to work refiguring all of the financial aids packets, adjusting other aid components so that students are able to receive an amount close to their promised total. Because the BEOG is the groundwork in the federal grant system, the recomputing necessary from estimated costs to actual costs causes a great deal of work

at a time when the financial aids office is most taxed. The total volume difference between the actual costs and estimated costs is small, but the amount of work is overwhelming.

The obvious solution to this problem would be the basing of BEOG grants on estimated costs. This would also solve another problem in the system, that of the progress reports demanded three times per year. The October report is due in the middle of November, but is rarely finished before January because of the problem of the actual cost regulation. "It is at this time impossible to get the report turned in on time when it is the middle of October before the actual costs can be computed." said the financial aids director.

The director also complained of the regulations as regards need as being too malleable, and that because of this he had several requests from Washington to act counter to stated regulations. "They need to set their act together and define these regulations and then stick to them," the director said.

The SEOG, NDSL and College Work Study programs are inconvenienced because of the actual cost requirement on the BEOG. as it is these aid sources which must be reshuffled to make up for any difference at the beginning of the fall semester. There is, however, an intrisic problem in these programs; they demand a yearly application for funding, which has both a short and a long form. The short form, some eight pages, is the form used by the University, but, according to the aids director, it could be further shortened

to a one page application based on previous levels. It is not only these 7 pages of paperwork that are involved; the whole system requires a yearly research and application process. "It seems to me that with the experience of ten years, the University should be assured a minimal level of support, which it is not under the present system," said the director.

The University has some 20 students on the LEEP program, but even with this small number the process is overly involved. The director suggested that the application process could easily be streamlined, as the government asks for the same information from the University every year in a series of five summary and certification reports.

The SSIG is a tightly run program, according the aids director, except for their deadline idiosyncracy. The deadline for the applications for this grant is not until August 1, well after all other financial aids deadlines. This causes a problem in that students receiving money from this source are not notified until after school has started, which, besides duplicating effort for those who already have full aids packages, could hurt in recruiting.

THE EFFECTS OF BUREAUCRACY

THE FACULTY

Bureaucratization, whatever its cause, affects every member of the University community in one way or another. As one vice-president put it, "The burden always flows downward and eventually reaches the individual at the lowest level". He cited a tremendous increase in administrative duties at the faculty level, witnessed by recent faculty work-load studies which show that the typical academic employee spends 25% of his time in administrative duties, ranging from reports to committee work.

The individual faculty member is caught in the spinoff of direct bureaucratic burden. The institution, in order to handle its administrative load, formulates and implements policies and procedures, often bolstered by new computer programs. And the result is that faculty members, even individual students, must often supply the same information in differing formats to suit the needs of a particular bureaucratic system or computer program.

Faculty members applying for agency or foundation grants must go through an internal application. The University has a whole office, staffed by a librarian and several professional people, just to advise faculty on how to fill out grant and contract applications. The process within the University involves several levels of approval before the application can even be sent out to the funding agency.

Faculty members also participate in the decision making process of the administration. There are some 59 standing committees

with some 500 faculty and staff members dealing with topics from Purchasing to Humane Care of Laboratory Animals. These committees, meeting at least once a year, are used as data collection and advisory groups in many working decisions. It is reported that 85% of the recommendations of these committees are instituted, but some faculty members say these committees are only modestly effective if the recommendations run counter to administrative wishes. A faculty member, spending as much as 40 to 50 hours per year on these committees, is often faced with his committee's recommendation either being ignored or being bogged down so long as to be ineffective. Faculty are also involved in administration through legislative activity of the Faculty Senate. Both of these administrative functions can take a great deal of time from teaching. Faculty Senate participation is optional, but standing committee activity is often a factor in promotion consideration.

This may be the most pervasive instance of the hidden cost of bureaucracy -- this impact on individual faculty members. Administrative staffing within academic departments has not kept up with increased administrative workload, with the result that a highly-qualified and well-paid faculty member may spend time filling out personnel action papers or budget forms, rather than spending time at the primary duties of teaching and research.

THE ADMINISTRATION

It may be said without fear of contradition that every University administrator feels the pinch of bureaucratization, but

in some cases, entire offices or agencies owe their very existence to the phenomenon.

Such is the case with the Office of Institutional Research, a staff of nine persons which directs much of the information-gathering and report-filing within the institution. The office assembles a significant amount of data on virtually every aspect of University activity including enrollments, degrees, employees, finances, curriculum, and library holdings, and in the gathering of information, involves virtually every campus office.

The office produces a number of standard studies of its own each year, including credit hour production, faculty workload, grade distribution, etc. which are shared throughout the University. The information is also disseminated outside the institution in numerous forms including federal HEGIS reports, requests from the Legislature, ACHE, other institutions, and the UA system, and the sharing of data with groups as divergent as AAUP, NEA, and NASULGC.

During calendar year 1976, the Office of Institutional Research handled 152 separate projects of this kind, a 70% increase over the previous year. The projection for the future is for similar increases in demands for data.

All of this data-gathering and dissemination, plus the growing centralization of business services (purchasing, payroll, etc.) have led to greatly increased use of the University's computer. During the 1976-77 academic year, some 40% of the Computer Center's $1 million in activity was generated by administrative needs of one kind or another.

These Administrative needs are substantial. The University, with some 15,000 students and 5,000 faculty and staff members, is not one-room school house operation. The various support functions of the administration are so all encompassing that it is indeed true that education, actual classroom activity, is only a part of the larger business function of the University.

Even the office of Academic Affairs, the branch of the central administration one would associate most with simple teaching purposes, runs a multitude of extra offices and groups. These include ROTC, Educational Media, International Studies, the Teaching Learning Center, Interim Term, Cooperative Education, the libraries, the Natural Resources Center, the Band, University Press, Research Grants, and the Health Service.

Student Affairs oversees Housing, Advising, all student organization activities, intramurals, freshman orientation and a whole scope of what Robert Hutchins of Chicago once called "babysitting" activities.

The director of Personnel Services reports that the University employs some 2,000 to 2,500 non-academic personnel, from clerical workers to maintenance men, from groundskeepers to top-level administrators.

The University has a section of the administration devoted to the development of private funding. The Development Office works in concert with the Alumni Affairs office, a privately incorporated group, on support group projects and individual solicitations.

The Office of University Relations includes sub-offices of Information Services, which handles print and broadcast news about the University, and Publication Services, which handles all internal publications. Both of these offices have large staffs, all involved in the not-so-simple process of communicating, within and without, the information necessary for the functining of the administrative framework.

The director of Business Services is also the Purchasing Manager. He employs in his office alone some 91 full-time workers and 8-13 students. He oversees such varied organizations as Procurement, Transportation and Storing (including a Typewriter Service and a $252,000 budgeted Vehicle Fleet), Centrex and WATS lines, Campus Mail, University Reproduction (not procreation, but publication) and the University Supply Store.

There are a host of other administrative and support offices necessary to the existence of this educational megalon. Not even mentioned, because it is self-supporting, is the whole Athletic Department bureaucracy. As one observer put it, "that is one hell of a can of worms".

These services, particulary the non-academic ones, are viewed with disdain, even disgust by the faculty. They claim that too much money is being spent on things other than education at this University. The administration points out that much of this administrative activity is self-supporting financially, and that all of it is necessary because of a variety of factors, not the least of which is the external control the University must put up with.

This conflict is not a simple one pitting conscientious faculty against work-bombarded administrators, it is a problem which grows year by year as universities find themselves more and more emulating business in order to survive. Along with this emulation, perhaps causing it, is the growing loss of internal and individual control of education.

CONCLUSION

The bureaucratization of The University of Alabama takes many forms and is motivated by many forces, internal and external. We found in our study that while the federal government, through its laws and regulations, creates a major paperwork burden for the institution, it is by far not the only, nor even the major, culprit.

Much of what the University has created in the way of bureaucracy is in response to forces at the state level. Even more, the University brings on itself through its attempt to efficiently "manage" a large and complex corporate body with thousands of students and employees.

In few instances did we find administrators openly critical of the bureaucracy in which they were personally involved: a dean welcomes accreditation and its headaches because it helps insure quality education; a planner welcomes reports and studies because they help the institution understand itself better; a financial affairs officer welcomes systematized business practices because they prevent abuses of the taxpayers' funds. The purposes are laudable, but the bureaucracies exist nonetheless.

One administrator did muse, however, about the overall effect of these humming computers and piles of paper. "You know", he said, "with all this attempt to plan and organize and understand, I wonder if we're really doing things any better than we used to do when the process was rather haphazard. I'm afraid we're really not."